

Summary
Agriculture, Fish and Water (AFW) Process
FOTG Executive Committee Meeting #2
March 22-23, 2000, Ellensburg, WA

March 22-Day One

Objectives: 1) To garner a better understanding of assessment methodologies for evaluating stream/habitat conditions for fish and farms needs; 2) View agricultural operations, stream landscapes, and fish enhancement activities in the Kittitas Valley area.

1. Welcome and Introductions

Introductions were made and we went over the agenda and activities scheduled for the next two days. The group went over the Dec. 9th draft meeting summary and approved the summary with no changes.

Gerry Jackson (USFWS) went through the hard copies of ESA and Bull Trout information and copies of the VHS tape of Feb. 23rd meetings that they brought with them. He and Tim thanked the Ag community for their participation in setting up the field tours.

2. FOTG Overview with Focus on Sections 3 & 4 (handout provided)

Frank Easter (NRCS) thanked the Kittitas County folks for their work in setting up the field tours. He presented a scaled-down version of the FOTG 101 training. FOTG development began in 1938 and they focused on soil erosion issues. There was not much emphasis on conservation plans until the early 60s. Best Management Plans came out of the Clean Water Act component. The concept of Resource Management Systems began showing up in the early 80s.

Frank went over the course overview and defined/explained key terms like “FOTG,” “Decision Maker,” “Resource Management System,” “Quality Criteria,” “Resource Problem,” “Conservation Practice,” “Section III--Conservation Management Systems,” “Section IV--144 Practice Standards and Specifications,” “The Dynamic Nature of the Planning Process,” and “Using the FOTG to Develop Conservation Plans, Phases 1-3.”

Q: How much leeway is there to make changes at the state level?

A.: A review schedule has been created--16 were done last year. This year-63 will be reviewed. They need to assign someone to customize them for the state. Got through Fed. Register or technical advisory group. They have the ability to make changes at the state level as well. Beginning May 1, they will begin testing new section 3 in the state.

Q: What triggers a farmer to going to NRCS?

A: Could be one of many reasons: signed up for a federal program, new technology available, upgrading irrigation system (want technical assistance), etc. He explained the tie to federal funding through FSA.

Q: Which of these will apply to federal nexus/ESA?

A: Tied to agency providing the funding. Relates to significant federal action assigned to the funding. Frank gave an example of this. They don't have the resources to do biological assessments for every conservation practice installed with federal funding. Need to develop efficient procedures.

Q: Concern where that is going to go.

A: (NMFS) Section 7 exists, clear on how to do consultations, designed on project by project scale. Backlog is a real problem. Solve the problems at larger scales to speed it up. Take a programmatic approach. Steve L. shared a recent example on how the system didn't work well dealing with another state agency.

Q: Why wasn't the Methow out in '98?

A: Agencies have always had a problem responding in a timely manner. We are still getting data on those three ditches. Offered letters to confirm the process.

Q: Water quality samples taken?

A: No, use existing water quality data available from state, tribes, etc. Use predictive models.

Q: What is the number of farms participating in programs?

A: Varies across the state.

Q: If someone is thinking about doing it, do they have to continue reporting their annual acreage production.

A: High level of participation in dryland, low percentage of participation in western WA (orchards in eastern WA, too). Believe reporting system has been changed.

Q: Why?

A: The way the program was structured—more beneficial to grain growers, not as beneficial for orchards, dairy farms, etc.

Q: D.C. has deemed it important in supplying funds for them?

A: Correct.

Q: What is the interest on the part of orchardists/dairies to participate?

A: Moving from production payments to environmental payments, not tied to the crop you're raising. CRP good example to compare.

A: Tree fruit industry is interested, but they don't have the political clout.

Comments:

- It would be interesting to compare areas of the state/types of participation.
- CRP has 25% cap. Major crops considered soy beans, cotton and corn, but not wheat.
- EPA has become a believer on water quality issues as they relate to farm plans. Field staff discovered no problems with farms with plans.

- People join programs because they fit their situations/needs.

Frank also went through the “Checklist of Resource Problems of Conditions,” (to address section 7 consultation.)

Q: If consultation occurs and you have to do a biological assessment, do you have guideline?

A: Handout addresses that question.

He explained the process from NRCS’ perspective. Good groundwork at the local level shortens the process. Planning is done up-front with early involvement. This takes time. Challenge: get these folks to your area and figure out what they want.

Frank spoke about the relationships between some of the programs and whether they trigger Section 7. So far, commodity have not triggered a Section 7, have on CREP. Not every practice/commodity goes through the same process.

Growers are using CREP/NRCS for technical assistance.

A checklist has been done on the two farms we will be touring. Technical notes also used in assessment process. Findings drive landowner recommendations. Look at agencies’ assessment procedures for similarities, gaps, etc.

3. Introduction to the Services’ Matrix Methodology

David Hirsh (NMFS) talked about the handout entitled, “Making Endangered Species...” Mike will make copies for those who want one.

Jodi Bush (USFWS) works with the Forest Service using the matrix. Have looked at grazing using the matrix, but it is more forest oriented. It is similar to NMFS’ matrix format with some exceptions. (Handouts can be made available)

Described the matrix, used for all species. Go from finer to broader scale. Just one tool they could use. Jodi explained key factors in this framework. This is a draft process, can be changed. She went through the benefits of using the matrix. Most important: looks at existing data.

NMFS and USFWS have separate matrixes. Changes in context will be important. It is an iterative, evolving process based on best available science, which will also evolve.

Q: If trying to meet ESA/CWA, a common assessment tool would be a baseline. If they contain differences, we can’t get to “what do we need to do.”

A: Would be nice, don’t know if there are current inconsistencies. Can’t assume there are.

A: NMFS developed this for western OR/western WA using research from those climates.

There half a dozen versions based on different geographies. They adapt their tools on a regional basis. Could be some overlap in the matrixes.

A: Compare indicators with quality measures.

Q: What is a built environment?

A: Urban—tuned/modified for that environment.

The group was largely in agreement, want to see the feds develop one common matrix that addresses species handled by each Service. Goal should be user-friendly science tools.

4. Properly Functioning Condition (PFC) Riparian Area Management Booklet handout, Assessing Proper Functioning Condition in the NRCS, PFC-What it is/What it isn't

Wayne Elmore talked about the tie between the matrixes. Field tested in two countries and 17 western states. Would like to see realistic objectives set out of this process.

Topics covered:

- Riparian Resources
- Attributes and Processes (Hydrogeomorphic, Vegetation, Erosion/Deposition, Soils,)
- Potential of the site
- How streams are rated
- Functional-at risk
- Non-functioning
- Riparian Area Recovery
- What PFC means/not mean

Wayne shared an example covering erosion/deposition, vegetative, and hydrologic elements. We are in the mildest climate in 10,000 years, but we are loosing streams in the highest numbers in history.

He explained the steps/elements in attaining PFC.

Q: Can we get copies of your PowerPoint presentation?

A: Can provide hard copies.

Comments:

- Won't ever eliminate take, need to provide coverage. Use PFC as foundation to long-term sustainability. Steve L. agreed.
- Use PFC for each individual segment of the stream. Cattlemen have used this for years. You can't lay tree height potential buffers on top of PFC.
- We should use performance based vs. prescriptive based.
- Need terms defined.
- Gerry J. asked again for Ag community's questions, including terms they would like to see defined.

5. Field Tour

Field tour booklets were provided by those Ag caucus members who helped organize the tour. The group spent the rest of the day visiting the following sites:

- Ellensburg Water Company Headworks and Yakima River (habitat issues)

- Bruten Ditch (screening and fish passage)
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation/Bureau of Reclamation Purchase
- Farm Tour of Stream and Irrigation Diversion Structure (speakers included Fish Biologist, Conservation District staff, and NRCS staff)
- Farm Tour of Streamside Management Area

March 23-Day Two

Objective: Open discussion on what's been presented and determine next steps.

1. Open Discussion on PFC, FOTG, and Federal Matrix Assessment Methods

Tim thanked the Ag caucus members for the excellent tours yesterday. He particularly appreciated the opportunity to see the farm sites. The group began with thoughts on yesterday's field tours. The federal agencies shared feedback based on issues that come out of the tours, in particular the buffer issues.

Gerry thanked the Ag caucus for a well-organized tour event, felt it was very helpful, particularly the landowners' sites. Our job here is to educate each other in terms of what do we need for fish. We need to be careful that we don't fall into the buffer trap. It's getting in the way of the other important issues like using PFC, achieving fish recovery, and healthy farm economies. Recovery will require some hard calls in where we want to put our efforts—getting the biggest bang for the buck. Liability is separate from recovery. Our goal is producing BMPs that can be incorporated into Sections 4, 7, and 10. This can give you legal coverage in practices. It will be incremental. He sees people wanting to do the right thing; they just don't always know what the right thing is. Need to continue this educational process. We can help interpret the ESA, need to demystify it. Moving in the right direction.

Q: Do you see some type of federal compensation to help?

A: It would make it a lot easier. There are a lot of programs out there that could help. Gave the Chehalis Basin effort as an example of how this could work. Technical assistance is what we could, in particular, bring to the table. Need to know what we have available right now in the way of funding. We could become a nation model. We have success stories around the US that we could bring in to share. Go to work on filling in the gaps. If we went to the federal delegates, it would be pretty hard to ignore.

Steve L. shared Gerry's appreciation of yesterday's landowners' willingness to share their stories with us. There was a lot of emphasis on buffer widths and urban vs. rural. Folks are reacting generally to the 4d rule in the arena of buffers. It identifies areas of exemptions. Urban development was added to the rule by the city of Portland. The city proposed this buffer in their plan. We are not imposing a 200-foot buffer in the 4d rule.

Q: Jacobs' farm, as an example, would not be required to do a 200-foot buffer, correct?

A: No, it wouldn't. In try to get the simple biological needs of fish in the plans, buffer needs are different in every one of them. There is no one size fits all.

Comment:

- Examples were there to show the effects of buffers we have heard would be applied. It's been legitimately discussed.

There was a brief discussion on the variable standards.

Q: In the CREP program, what buffers are being suggested?

A: 3/4rds of the site tree height (60-80 feet). In that case we are looking at 40-50 foot buffer. No trees, buffer shrinks in size. Can adjust down to 40 feet. Can't rent it to another rancher. Objective: making this work. You can only get a check from one federal program.

A: For non-CREP, Jacobs' site would meet our requirements.

Q: Federal services are not predisposed to a one size fits all requirement?

A: Absolutely not.

A: Processes could lead to variable buffer, if any.

Comments:

We are new to these management needs. We have been on a long curve of environmental responsibility. Need to identify what we can best accomplish. Would like to see buffer width off of the table. Legal opinion—better assume that that can happen. Taking acres out of production affects a needed commodity that will be taken out of somewhere else. We would be happy to take the issue off of the table.

It's premature to start talking about this. Need to establish the physical integrity--buffer width is one of many. There will probably be buffer widths.

Media coverage tends to cite emotional responses. Get discussion down to fish needs, funding available. Put money into on-the-ground projects, get on with it. Share the burden of funding those activities needed.

Q: Needs clarification—4d rule vs. recovery, what is considered take? If you don't currently have the species in your system, are the parties upstream considered part of the take issue?

A: We consider man made blockages to passage takes. Our first priorities are getting fish to stream networks. It's not cut and dried issue.

Q: If there are no salmonids in the system, do we have a potential liability for take in man-made impediments? Is potential of liability in place in the 4d rule?

A: If no fish are there, (altered landscape), it makes it more difficult. Our intention is to bring back historic runs. Not a simple situation.

A: Definition of take is just a legal definition. Harm arena has been further defined. Take via harm does not require that a fish be killed, etc. It's the habitat that is the issue. It's a stronger issue.

Q: Are buffer standards required if no listed fish are in a body of water, and it meets CWA standards?

A: If clean water is what's being looked at, it suffices. Have to look at down stream affects. What's the physical context?

A: There are streams that can meet CWA but still not support fish and their habitat needs.

A: This dialog is why we're here--getting predictability and fish needs met. Need to explore PFC. Water use will be looked at.

Comments:

- It was suggested that on the Chesapeake Bay HCP program be on April's agenda. Flexible buffer zones. Can use other programs as examples; don't need to start at ground zero.
- We need to understand the functions needed before talking about buffers. Look more in depth at PFCs. Create our own pathways. Create trust between members. There is a wide chasm in trust.
- Start with functions. Need special plan to link Ag certainty.
- We are building trust; we are not here for building a case for going to court. There is concern among our chapters that the Ag com. can continue to stay economically viable. Not looking at buffers. Need to go back and guarantee a high level of success, so that we can go back to DC and support funding requests.
- We are talking about trust and communication. We need to be flexible enough and open-minded. Look at projects like Chesapeake Bay project.
- USFWS volunteered to get staff in to talk about that project. Also have other examples: Black Foot Challenge, similar model. Could pull information on that project together.
- There is a fundamental lack of trust around the table. We have a window of opportunity for dialog; no preconceived notions of what needs to be done on each individual farm. What steps do we take to get us to common understanding? Integrate: Services discussion around general matrix that could be developed. This will help us flush out what are we talking about on each property.

Q: Would you ever agree that fish don't have to be in every historical stream?

A: True in general nature. Recovery planning process is determining why and what you need to recover. Bald eagle example, need to do species-by-species.

Q: Growing agreement on functions driving this. What are functions that landowners are responsible for providing?

A: Don't like the term buffers. Would prefer looking at: what streams need. Common events (1-3 years.) double it and that gives you the 50-year flood plain. What are we going to need to hold this stream together, and not just for fish. How much stability do we need?

Jim J. made the following suggestions:

1. The feds meet to discuss the concept of a common matrix. (Areas that are consistent/not consistent.)

2. Need more of an understanding of biological functions and PFC. What are the missing pieces?
3. We have jargon/definitions to clarify.
4. Need open, active discussion on the typing of streams. What's needed to get properly functioning streams?
5. High centering on FOTG focus. Back the FOTG discussion out for a while. Risk is going to be so high to meet the certainty; we won't get there.

Q: As it relates to farm plans, are Services trying to achieve functions on an individual landscape?

A: The deal way to address that issue would be watershed assessments. FOTG is critical piece in the scheme of things.

A: The questions are already being integrated in many key watersheds.

Q: Some are involved in a whole series of things, and could take advantage of what's already going on. How do we provide tools to the Ag community?

A: Misconception: matrixes are for two completely different reasons. Biology for the fish, sustainability of the system, etc. Suggested a half-day presentation of what we're looking for. Where can we apply both of those?

A: Same is true on watershed plan/ farm plan. How do those work together?

Q: Could the Growth Management Hearing Boards trump anything we do?

A: Shoreline, Growth Management, and SEPA—same issue.

A: It would be helpful if you were thinking about your own individual landscapes and how this could relate.

Comments:

- All these issues could be covered in April. One day: physical/biological; another day of PFC training/stream typing.
- Don't fill up the tour agenda up too much.

Action Items:

Tim volunteered to provide the definitions piece. He agreed that the feds should try to bring these pieces together, and pointed out that handouts do get into some of these issues.

The group had a discussion of possible agenda items—April 26, physics/biology training in the morning; field tour in the afternoon.

The tour could look at spawning habitat in Ag lands and drainage/diking in drainage system. Tour would cover 2/3rds in delta, with the rest upriver.

2. Pesticides

Comments:

- Jim J. stated that this is an issue for them. The label is the law according to us and an application consistent with the label should be exempt from take. Action is taken if you

don't follow the label. Section 3 is national label. We have ability under Section 3 to add more to the label. Section 18--emergency exemptions. We want to focus on sections 18 or 3 and work with concerns with NMFS & USFWS. If you apply with label, you're exempt. This needs to be fixed in the 4d rule before it comes out. Focus on pesticides in areas of concerns. We want to come up with a way to move this forward.

- Gerry J. suggested that a technical team looks at the most commonly used chemicals and focus on risk analysis.
- Jim stated that use compliance data is available through his agency.
- Gerry stated that EPA has not consulted on pesticides in any sense. There is a huge backlog of chemicals being used and registration that has not gone through that process. Problem – trying to put national team together to look at state uses of chemicals and looking at potential impact on fish.
- Steve L. advised the group that EPA has not asked NMFS to consult at this point. Understands the state's dilemma. Doesn't know where to go yet. Participating with USFWS and Ag.
- Jim stated that a toxicity study is being done (high, moderate, low). The rule as we read it, basically says no pesticides.
- Steve George shared that noxious weeds are a problem and the only way to keep them under control is with the use of pesticides. Certainty is needed, letting us know that we can use these pesticides according to the label without any problems.
- Julie H. agreed that there is a huge backlog at EPA. There are older pesticides that they haven't consulted on. Using the pesticide according to the label isn't always a guarantee that you aren't affecting the water.
- Steve L. believes that these are difficult issues. There is a misrepresentation on what the 4d rules say. NMFS did not say no pesticide use.
- Karla F. stated that the 4d says we know that we don't have the data needed but we'll work on it as we go. The Ag community shouldn't be faulted for a federal problem. You can't say "none" until it's proven unsafe.
- Jim J. shared that in a lot of instances a 10-week delay on an emergency pesticide use can devastate users. We need to work on how to build the system. A small number of chemicals are causing the problem.
- Steve G. encouraged the group to work out this problem. A 10 to 3 week delay can devastate their hop crop.

- Chris C: stated that the pesticide issue is a key component. You will not have the crop volume if we're unable to use pesticides. There is a real strong fear that the standard ongoing farm practices could put them at risk of take. Would like to help fish agencies come to a comfort level. Would like a presentation from agency science guys demonstrating your fears and provide the opportunity to bring back solutions. If the fundamental practices that the Ag community uses are unacceptable, why bother going on any further?
- Chris C. shared that they have to have the ability to take messages home to the people they represent explaining, but what are they suppose to say? Possibility of being guilty of take.
- Tim stated that we have to come to an understanding in context. A scientific discussion is needed with language or policy that recognizes risks. Jim and Gerry need to get together and schedule to work with other agencies to get a solution.
- Jim J. shared that state experts are already meeting and a report will be brought back to the Mount Vernon meeting. Industry staff he recommended as potential members of the technical workgroup includes Alan Schriber, Alan Selsot, Art Losey, Walley Ewart, and Steve George.
- Tim asked the group to remember that the disconnect did not happen at this table, but at a different level. The agencies cannot give you a definite answer at this point.
- Gerry J. welcomes any help people would like to provide. But, bulltrout has been listed for the last 2 years without any penalty being acted upon.

Action Item:

Tim summarized the conversation by asking that we fix the problem, as this issue is important to the Ag caucus. Jim, Gerry, Ag caucus technical staff will work on a white paper, due one month from now. Ag caucus needs to provide the names of technical staff they would like to see involved. Gerry & Jim will set up a meeting to accomplish:

Understanding what the concerns are, defining the issues;
 Finding technical participants and bringing them together; and
 Focusing on a specific set of issues with appropriate technical staff.

2. 4(d) Rule Status: Placeholder Language

These was a discussion around two proposed meetings:

1. State discussion with NMFS and USFWS on what from a legal aspect is possible.
2. Meeting specifically of an AFW workgroup to engage with agency partners in deciding what can and cannot go into the 4(d) rule.

- Jim stated that he needs to know from the Services what won't work and why.
- Karla suggested that every Ag caucus member should be involved to the meeting.
- Tim agreed and stated that the meeting should occur in the next two weeks. If everyone is not available, then a smaller group should meet.
- Steve Appel agreed with Karla, and asked that a date be established.
- Mary B. asked that the Services provide exactly we're dealing with. They need it to move.

Action Item:

The group chose a tentative April 11 date in Ellensburg, 9-1 pm for the 4d rule discussion. (What's possible, what's not possible.) Tim will coordinate.

4. Federal funding

- Funding requests have already gone out (DC). Need initial take—what could be funded this year? Modest request list. Start prioritizing. If fed/state funding is a part of this process, what are the various nexus of those priorities?
- It was suggested that an initial list of available funding sources be prepared and what it takes to qualify. (Dan Evans has already started this process).
- It may be too late for federal money requests; maybe SRFB money may be available.
- Bill Ruckelshaus is extremely sensitive to salmon/Ag requests.
- Where are the federal opportunities for funding projects? (water/land management)
- We only have a week or two to get back to Dicks and Murray.
- We would need a clear, well-written proposal to take to DC, not something thrown together. Should be substantial. This will be coordinated through Tim and Dan.

5. Meeting Schedule:

April meeting in Mt. Vernon-firm up agenda and field tour. Will determine whether we need July and August meetings when we meet in Mt. Vernon.

6. Meeting Handouts

Agenda
 December 9th final draft summary
 Year 2000 Meeting Schedule
 FOTG Executive Committee Member List
 FOTG Workgroup Member List
 AFW FOTG General Ground Rules
 AFW FOTG Specific Ground Rules

Draft Guiding Principles
Draft Goals and Objectives
Twenty-One Years-Oregon's Bear Creek Study
The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Field Office Technical Guide
Technical Notes
Checklist of Resource Problems or Conditions
Assessing NRCS
PFC-What it is/isn't
Riparian Area Management, A User Guide to Assessing Proper Functioning Condition and the Supporting Science for Lotic Areas.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, Endangered Species Act of 1973, As Amended through the 100th Congress.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Lacey, WA, Mar 10, 1993, Rev. Dec 8, 1999. Biological Assessment Preparation and Review; Federal Register, Tuesday June 3, 1986, Part II, Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Commerce, NOAA, 50 CFR Part 402 Interagency Cooperation - Endangered Species Act of 1973, as Amended; Final Rule.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, March 1998. Endangered Species consultation Handbook (available from Superintendent of Documents)

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service, November 1966, Habitat Conservation Planning Handbook. (Available on the web at www.fws.gov - go to Endangered Species, then Habitat Conservation Plans and Agreements.)

Federal Register Monday November 1, 1999, Part II, Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 50 CFR Part 17 Endangered and Threatened Status for Bull Trout in the Coterminous United States; Final Rule. Notice of Intent to Prepare a Proposed Special Rule Pursuant to Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act for the Bull Trout; Proposed Rule.

Federal Register Vol. 64, No. 210, Monday November 1, 1999, Proposed Rules, pgs 58934-58936. Department of the Interior, Fish and Wildlife Service, 50 CFR Part 17. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Notice of Intent to Prepare a Proposed Special Rule Pursuant to Section 4(d) of the Endangered Species Act for the Bull Trout.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Public Affairs Office, May 1998, Bull Trout Facts. Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, News Release 99-71, October 27, 1999. Service Lists Two More Populations of Bull Trout as Threatened..

Bull Trout and the Endangered Species Act, Commonly Asked Questions and Answers Oct 1999

How will this Bull Trout listing affect me? October 1999

Bull Trout and Special 4(d) Rules, Questions and Answers, October 1999

Chronology of Bull Trout Events, June 1999

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, December 9, 1998. Bull Trout Interim Conservation Guidance.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (adapted from the National Marine Fisheries Service) February 1998. DRAFT - A Framework to Assist in Making Endangered Species Act Determinations of Effect for Individual or Grouped Actions at the Bull Trout Subpopulation Watershed Scale.

Bull Trout Bibliography.

Draft summary prepared: 3-28-00

Final summary approved by Executive Committee:

AFW FOTG Executive Committee Meeting #2
March 22 & 23, 2000
Attendee List

Name	Organization
Appel, Steve	WSFB
Borck, Gretchen	WAWG
Boss, Pat	WSPC
Burke, Mary	WA Cattlemen's Assoc.
Bush, Jodi	USFWS
Carpenter, Jack	KRD
Chain, David	NRCS
Charlton, Mark	Kittitas County Farm Bureau
Cheney, Chris	Dairy Federation
Crerar, Linda	WSDA
Crose, Harold	NRCS
Denison, Karl	USFS
Deusen, Millard	WDFW
Dyckman, Claire	King County DDES
Easter, Frank	NRCS
Eberhart, Urban B.	Kittitas Reclamation District-Board Member
Elmore, Wayne	NRST
Faulconer, Lee	WSDA
Fullerton, Karla Kay	WA Cattlemen's Assoc.
George, Ben	Taneum Canal Comp.
George, Craig	WA State Hay Growers
George, Steven	Hop Growers of WA
Hagensen, Julie	EPA
Halupka, Karl	USFWS
Hamilton, Rod	USDA-FSA
Hart, Bob	Skagit County
Hirsh, David	NMFS
Isaak, Kurt	WACD
Jackson, Gerry	USFWS
Jensen, Martha	USFWS
Jesernig, Jim	WSDA
Johnson, Linda	WA Farm Bureau
LaCroix, Paul	Western WA Farm Crops Assn.
Landino, Steve	NMFS
Lunn, Mike	NRST
Mackey, Bruce	Potatoes
Mayer, Kirk	WA Growers Clearing House
Meyer, Steve	WCC
Millam, Phil	EPA

Morley, Philip	Snohomish County
Nelson, Rick	WA Cattlemen's Assoc.
Parsons, Jeff	National Audubon Society
Peay, Wendy,	WHGA
Poulsen, Karen	WA Hay Growers
Poulson, Barbara	WA Farm Bureau
Poulson, Mike	Farm Bureau
Ralph, Alisa	USFWS
Ready, Carol	KRD & Kittitas Co. Water Purveyors
Rice, Chuck	EPA
Rundlett, Mike	WCC
Schnebly, Jim	Kittitas Reclamation District
Smith, Paula	WCC
Stuart, Don	WA Assoc. of Conservation Districts
Trefry, Stu	Conservation Commission
Tuorgyak, Paul	Tree Fruit
Wallace, Dick	Ecology
Weeks, Joe	Colville Confederated Tribes
Wiley, Ron	NRST
Willis, Lynn	WSDA
Wisniewski, Veronica	Whatcom County
Zimmerman, Nancy & Jim	WA Fish Growers/WA State Grange